



SATOSHICOIN

WHITE PAPER



SatoshiCoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System

SatoshiCoin Team of Developers

support@satoshiera.com

www.satoshiera.com

Abstract. Due to immense popularity of Bitcoin, more and more developers are trying to own it and fork it for their own benefits. They come up with their so called faster, secure and reliable coin with the aim to replace Bitcoin in future and manipulate the market in their own interest. Moreover, we have made Bitcoin as decentralized digital currency; countries and governments trying to control it by forking it, accepting and promoting the new clone. They then imposed certain regulations on the forked versions of Bitcoin in an attempt to make it centralized. This results in clashes between governments and stack holders which have negative impact on the image of Bitcoin in general public. To deal with these issues and monopolies, SatoshiCoin's team taken a further step to create SatoshiCoin, a Peer-to-Peer digital currency in support of the original bitcoin that will operate and run separately from Bitcoin. Since Satoshi Nakamoto made the Bitcoin for common man but due to involvement of market tycoons and rich miners, BTC is now out of range of a common man. Built to be mined on an ordinary PC, Bitcoin is now impossible to be mined by a common computer user or student. To stick with the sole purpose of its creation, SatoshiCoin comes to play its role. With emergence of SatoshiCoin, a common man can mine, buy, sell and trade again in Bitcoin as SatoshiCoin is convertible to Bitcoin and vice versa.

1. Introduction

SatoshiCoin is developed on the vision of Satoshi Nakamoto, that is, Bitcoin for common men. SatoshiCoin is a new stand-alone innovative cryptocurrency that can be converted to Bitcoin anytime and vice versa. SatoshiCoin uses a publicly accessible system of Blockchain, a public ledger where each and every transaction is recorded and open to public. Moreover, SatoshiCoin will support Bitcoin in all aspect.

2. The Necessity

Bitcoin emerged as a popular medium of exchange and is the first digital currency that has attracted a substantial number of users. Bitcoin provides pseudonymous transactions with a one to one relationship between sender and receiver. Since its inception in 2009, Bitcoin has been rapidly growing in mainstream adoption and merchant usage. Due to its popularity, developers trying to own it and when failed; forked it. On the other hand, governments of different developed countries trying to make the bitcoin centralized and bring it under their own regulation. These market manipulations are neither in the favor of bitcoin nor for common man. To overcome these issues, there was a need to bring a coin to market that is like Bitcoin, not goes against the original theme and sole purpose of Bitcoin and that can be in reach of common man for merchant usage. A coin that can be converted into Bitcoin and back to SatoshiCoin from Bitcoin as and when needed. This is where SatoshiCoin Team comes up with SatoshiCoin. A coin with faster transaction solution yet accessible to and mineable by common man.

In this white paper, we propose a series of improvements to make SatoshiCoin a purely decentralized, strongly anonymous cryptocurrency, with tamperproof instant transactions and a secondary peer-to-peer network incentivized to provide services to the Satoshi Coin Network.

3. Technical Background

SatoshiCoin is written in C/C++ on the backend, and PHP and CSS3 on the frontend webpage while Android wallet of SatoshiCoin is written in Java Language. Our Web based app wallet database uses SQL to allow the use and running of complex queries. It works asynchronously and allows for fast processing of all functions such as network transactions.

4. Key Innovation Factors

SatoshiCoin is built on the principle of “Bitcoin for Common Man”. Since the raise in the cost of BTC and increase in the mining difficulty make it out of reach of a common man. To let all the people get benefitted from decentralized peer-to-peer cryptocurrency, SatoshiCoin comes to play its role.

5. Features At Glance

Name	SatoshiCoin
Symbol	STOC
PoW Algorithm	Scrypt
Block Time	120 Seconds
TX fee	0 – 0.1 STOC
Difficulty Retarget	48 Hours
P2P Port	23601
RPC Port	23602
Max Coins	50 Million STOC
Address letter	S
Mining Reward	27 STOC per block
Block halving	840000 blocks

6. Transactions

SatoshiCoin defines an electronic coin as a chain of digital signatures. Each owner transfers the coin to the next by digitally signing a hash of the previous transaction and the public key of the next owner and adding these to the end of the coin. A payee can verify the signatures to verify the chain of ownership.

The problem of course is the payee cannot verify that one of the owners did not double-spend the coin. A common solution is to introduce a trusted central authority, or mint, that checks every transaction for double spending. After each transaction, the coin must be returned to the mint to issue a new coin, and only coins issued directly from the mint are trusted not to be double-spent. The problem with this solution is that the fate of the entire money system depends on the company running the mint, with every transaction having to go through them, just like a bank.

We need a way for the payee to know that the previous owners did not sign any earlier transactions. For our purposes, the earliest transaction is the one that counts, so we don't care about later attempts to double-spend. The only way to confirm the absence of a transaction is to be aware of all transactions. In the mint based model, the mint was aware of all transactions and decided which arrived first. To accomplish this without a trusted party, transactions must be publicly announced, and we need a system for participants to agree on a single history of the order in which they were received. The payee needs proof that at the time of each transaction, the majority of nodes agreed it was the first received.

7. Timestamp Server

The solution we propose begins with a timestamp server. A timestamp server works by taking a hash of a block of items to be timestamped and widely publishing the hash, such as in a newspaper or Usenet post. The timestamp proves that the data must have existed at the time, obviously, in order to get into the hash. Each timestamp includes the previous timestamp's hash, forming a chain, with each additional timestamp reinforcing the ones before it.

8. Proof-of-Work

To implement a distributed timestamp server on a peer-to-peer basis, we will need to use a proof-of-work system similar to Adam Back's Hashcash, rather than newspaper or Usenet posts. The proof-of-work involves scanning for a value that when hashed, such as with SHA-256, the hash begins with a number of zero bits. The average work required is exponential in the number of zero bits required and can be verified by executing a single hash.

For our timestamp network, we implement the proof-of-work by incrementing a nonce in the block until a value is found that gives the block's hash the required zero bits. Once the CPU effort has been expended to make it satisfy the proof-of-work, the block cannot be changed without redoing the work. As later blocks are chained after it, the work to change the block would include redoing all the blocks after it.

The proof-of-work also solves the problem of determining representation in majority decisionmaking. If the majority were based on one-IP-address-one-vote, it could be subverted by anyone able to allocate many IPs. Proof-of-work is essentially one-CPU-one-vote. The majority decision is represented by the longest chain, which has the greatest proof-of-work effort invested in it. If a majority of CPU power is controlled by honest nodes, the honest chain will grow the fastest and outpace any competing chains. To modify a past block, an attacker would have to redo the proof-of-work of the block and all blocks after it and then catch up with and surpass the work of the honest nodes. We will show later that the probability of a slower attacker catching up diminishes exponentially as subsequent blocks are added.

To compensate for increasing hardware speed and varying interest in running nodes over time, the proof-of-work difficulty is determined by a moving average targeting an average number of blocks per hour. If they're generated too fast, the difficulty increases.

9. Network

The steps to run the network are as follows:

- 1) New transactions are broadcast to all nodes.
- 2) Each node collects new transactions into a block.

- 3) Each node works on finding a difficult proof-of-work for its block.
- 4) When a node finds a proof-of-work, it broadcasts the block to all nodes.
- 5) Nodes accept the block only if all transactions in it are valid and not already spent.
- 6) Nodes express their acceptance of the block by working on creating the next block in the chain, using the hash of the accepted block as the previous hash.

Nodes always consider the longest chain to be the correct one and will keep working on extending it. If two nodes broadcast different versions of the next block simultaneously, some nodes may receive one or the other first. In that case, they work on the first one they received, but save the other branch in case it becomes longer. The tie will be broken when the next proof-of-work is found and one branch becomes longer; the nodes that were working on the other branch will then switch to the longer one.

New transaction broadcasts do not necessarily need to reach all nodes. As long as they reach many nodes, they will get into a block before long. Block broadcasts are also tolerant of dropped messages. If a node does not receive a block, it will request it when it receives the next block and realizes it missed one.

10. Incentive

By convention, the first transaction in a block is a special transaction that starts a new coin owned by the creator of the block. This adds an incentive for nodes to support the network, and provides a way to initially distribute coins into circulation, since there is no central authority to issue them. The steady addition of a constant amount of new coins is analogous to gold miners expending resources to add gold to circulation. In our case, it is CPU time and electricity that is expended.

The incentive can also be funded with transaction fees. If the output value of a transaction is less than its input value, the difference is a transaction fee that is added to the incentive value of the block containing the transaction. Once a predetermined number of coins have entered circulation, the incentive can transition entirely to transaction fees and be completely inflation-free. The incentive may help encourage nodes to stay honest. If a greedy attacker is able to assemble more CPU power than all the honest nodes, he would have to choose between using

itto defraud people by stealing back his payments, or using it to generate new coins. He ought to find it more profitable to play by the rules, such rules that favour him with more new coins than everyone else combined, than to undermine the system and the validity of his own wealth.

11. Reclaiming Disk Space

Once the latest transaction in a coin is buried under enough blocks, the spent transactions before it can be discarded to save disk space. To facilitate this without breaking the block's hash, transactions are hashed in a Merkle Tree, with only the root included in the block's hash. Old blocks can then be compacted by stubbing off branches of the tree. The interior hashes do not need to be stored.

A block header with no transactions would be about 80 bytes. If we suppose blocks are generated every 10 minutes, $80 \text{ bytes} * 6 * 24 * 365 = 4.2 \text{ MB}$ per year. With computer systems typically selling with 2GB of RAM as of 2008, and Moore's Law predicting current growth of 1.2GB per year, storage should not be a problem even if the block headers must be kept in memory.

12. Simplified Payment Verification

It is possible to verify payments without running a full network node. A user only needs to keep a copy of the block headers of the longest proof-of-work chain, which he can get by querying network nodes until he's convinced he has the longest chain, and obtain the Merkle branch linking the transaction to the block it's timestamped in. He can't check the transaction for himself, but by linking it to a place in the chain, he can see that a network node has accepted it, and blocks added after it further confirm the network has accepted it.

As such, the verification is reliable as long as honest nodes control the network, but is more vulnerable if the network is overpowered by an attacker. While network nodes can verify transactions for themselves, the simplified method can be fooled by an attacker's fabricated transactions for as long as the attacker can continue to overpower the network. One strategy to protect against this would be to accept alerts from network nodes when they detect an invalid block, prompting the user's software to download the full block and alerted transactions

to confirm the inconsistency. Businesses that receive frequent payments will probably still want to run their own nodes for more independent security and quicker verification.

13. Combining and Splitting Value

Although it would be possible to handle coins individually, it would be unwieldy to make a separate transaction for every cent in a transfer. To allow value to be split and combined, transactions contain multiple inputs and outputs. Normally there will be either a single input from a larger previous transaction or multiple inputs combining smaller amounts, and at most two outputs: one for the payment, and one returning the change, if any, back to the sender.

It should be noted that fan-out, where a transaction depends on several transactions, and those transactions depend on many more, is not a problem here. There is never the need to extract a complete standalone copy of a transaction's history.

14. Privacy

The traditional banking model achieves a level of privacy by limiting access to information to the parties involved and the trusted third party. The necessity to announce all transactions publicly precludes this method, but privacy can still be maintained by breaking the flow of information in another place: by keeping public keys anonymous. The public can see that someone is sending an amount to someone else, but without information linking the transaction to anyone. This is similar to the level of information released by stock exchanges, where the time and size of individual trades, the "tape", is made public, but without telling who the parties were.

As an additional firewall, a new key pair should be used for each transaction to keep them from being linked to a common owner. Some linking is still unavoidable with multi-input transactions, which necessarily reveal that their inputs were owned by the same owner. The risk is that if the owner of a key is revealed, linking could reveal other transactions that belonged to the same owner.

15. Calculations

We consider the scenario of an attacker trying to generate an alternate chain faster than the honest chain. Even if this is accomplished, it does not throw the system open to arbitrary changes, such as creating value out of thin air or taking money that never belonged to the attacker. Nodes are not going to accept an invalid transaction as payment, and honest nodes will never accept a block containing them. An attacker can only try to change one of his own transactions to take back money he recently spent.

The race between the honest chain and an attacker chain can be characterized as a Binomial Random Walk. The success event is the honest chain being extended by one block, increasing its lead by +1, and the failure event is the attacker's chain being extended by one block, reducing the gap by -1.

We now consider how long the recipient of a new transaction needs to wait before being sufficiently certain the sender can't change the transaction. We assume the sender is an attacker who wants to make the recipient believe he paid him for a while, and then switch it to pay back to himself after some time has passed. The receiver will be alerted when that happens, but the sender hopes it will be too late.

The receiver generates a new key pair and gives the public key to the sender shortly before signing. This prevents the sender from preparing a chain of blocks ahead of time by working on it continuously until he is lucky enough to get far enough ahead, then executing the transaction at that moment. Once the transaction is sent, the dishonest sender starts working in secret on a parallel chain containing an alternate version of his transaction.

The recipient waits until the transaction has been added to a block and z blocks have been linked after it. He doesn't know the exact amount of progress the attacker has made, but assuming the honest blocks took the average expected time per block, the attacker's potential progress will be a Poisson distribution with expected value:

12. Conclusion

We have proposed a system for electronic transactions without relying on trust. We started with the usual framework of coins made from digital signatures, which provides strong control of ownership, but is incomplete without a way to prevent double-spending. To solve this, we proposed a peer-to-peer network using proof-of-work to record a public history of transactions that quickly becomes computationally impractical for an attacker to change if honest nodes control a majority of CPU power. The network is robust in its unstructured simplicity. Nodes work all at once with little coordination. They do not need to be identified, since messages are not routed to any particular place and only need to be delivered on a best effort basis. Nodes can leave and rejoin the network at will, accepting the proof-of-work chain as proof of what happened while they were gone. They vote with their CPU power, expressing their acceptance of valid blocks by working on extending them and rejecting invalid blocks by refusing to work on them. Any needed rules and incentives can be enforced with this consensus mechanism.